arXiv:1203.2209v2 [math.CO] 11 Sep 2012

On the robustness of random k-cores

Cristiane M. Sato*
Dept. of Combinatorics and Optimization
University of Waterloo
Waterloo ON
Canada N2L 3G1
E-mail: `cmsato@gmail.com`

February 25, 2013

Abstract

The k-core of a graph is its maximal subgraph with minimum degree at least k. In this paper, we address robustness questions about k-cores. Given a k-core, remove one edge uniformly at random and find its new k-core. We are interested in how many vertices are deleted from the original k-core to find the new one. This can be seem as a measure of robustness of the original k-core. We prove that, if the initial k-core is chosen uniformly at random from the k-cores with n vertices and m edges, its robustness depends essentially on its average degree c. We prove that, if $c \to k$, then the new k-core is empty with probability $1 + o(1)$. We define a constant c'_k such that when $k + \varepsilon < c < c'_k - \varepsilon$, the new k-core is empty with probability bounded away from zero and, if $c > c'_k + \psi(n)$ with $\psi(n) = \omega(n^{-1/4})$, $\psi(n) > 0$ and c is bounded, then the probability that the new k-core has less than $n - h(n)$ vertices goes to zero, for every $h(n) = \omega(\psi(n)^{-1})$.

1 Introduction

The k-core of a graph is its maximal subgraph with minimum degree at least k. The k-core of a graph is unique and it can be obtained by iteratively deleting vertices of degree smaller than k. The k-core of a graph that already has minimum degree at least k is the graph itself. So we also say that graphs (and multigraphs) with minimum degree at least k are k-cores.

The investigation of k-cores in random graphs was started by Bollobás [1] in 1984 in connection with k-connected subgraphs in random graphs. There has been much success in the use of k-cores due to their amenability to analysis. For some earlier results on the k-cores of random graphs, see [9, 10, 15].

A seminal result in this area was proved by Pittel, Spencer and Wormald [16]: they determined the threshold c_k for the emergence of a giant k-core in $G(n, m)$. Roughly

---

*The author received an Ontario Graduate Scholarship during this project.

speaking, if the average degree is below this threshold, the k-core of $G(n,m)$ is empty with probability going to 1 as $n \to \infty$, and above the threshold the k-core has a linear number of vertices with probability going to 1. After this result, many proofs using a variety of techniques were given for the emergence of a giant k-core in graphs and hypergraphs; see [3, 5, 2, 8, 6, 7, 18].

We are interested in finding how robust this giant k-core of $G(n,m)$ is as a k-core. More precisely, if we delete a random edge in the k-core of $G(n,m)$ and obtain its new k-core, is the new k-core much smaller than the original one? This can be seen as a measure of the robustness of the giant k-core. We do not restrict ourselves to the k-core of $G(n,m)$: we consider a k-core chosen uniformly at random with given number of vertices and edges, then we delete an edge from it uniformly at random and obtain the new k-core.

We define a constant c'_k and analyse the behaviour of the random k-cores with average degree below and above c'_k. We work with multigraphs with given degree sequence and then we deduce the desired results for simple graphs. Throughout the paper we use a simple deletion algorithm (and some variants) to find the k-core of a graph: the algorithm iteratively removes vertices of degree less than k until all remaining vertices have degree at least k. We couple this deletion algorithm with a random walk. For the case with bounded average degree $c > c'_k + \psi(n)$ with $\psi(n) = \omega(n^{-1/4})$ and $\psi(n) > 0$, this strategy works quite well: we prove that the deletion algorithm and the random walk both terminate/die in less than $t(n)$ steps with probability going to 1, for every $t(n) = \omega(\psi(n)^{-1})$. This also implies that, when $2m/n = c_k + \phi(n) > c_k + n^{-\delta}$, where $\delta \in (0, 1/4)$ is a constant, the probability of deleting $\omega(\psi(n)^{-1})$ vertices of the k-core of $G(n,m)$ to find its new k-core after deleting a single random edge goes to zero.

For the case with average degree $c \leq c'_k - \varepsilon$ where ε is a positive constant, we use the random walk to show that, for any $h(n) \to \infty$, with probability going to 1, the deletion algorithm deletes $\Theta(n)$ vertices or at most $h(n)$ vertices. When $c \to k$, the probability of deleting $\Theta(n)$ vertices goes to 1. Then we use the differential equation method as described in [19] to show that, if $\Theta(n)$ vertices are deleted, then the deletion algorithm will not stop until the k-core has less than γn vertices a.a.s. (where we can choose γ as small as we want). Using a result in [6], we prove that in this case the k-core must be empty a.a.s. This finishes the proof that, for $k + \varepsilon \leq c \leq c'_k + \varepsilon$ and any $h(n) \to \infty$, the deletion algorithm deletes n vertices or at most $h(n)$ vertices a.a.s.; and that for $c \to k$, we delete n vertices a.a.s. Proving that the probability of deleting all vertices in the case $k + \varepsilon \leq c \leq c'_k - \varepsilon$ is bounded away from zero require some more work: we couple the deletion algorithm for multigraphs and simple graphs for $t(n) \to \infty$ steps. This will then imply that the probability of deleting $h(n)$ vertices for some $h(n) \to \infty$ is bounded away from zero and so we must delete all vertices with probability bounded away from zero.

2 Main results

Let $G = G(k,n,m)$ be a graph sampled uniformly at random from the (simple) k-cores with vertex set $[n]$ and $m = m(n)$ edges. For any graph H, let $K(H)$ denote the k-core of H and let $W(H)$ be $|V(H)| - |V(K(H-e))|$, where e is an edge chosen uniformly at random from the edges of H. That is, $W(H)$ is the number of vertices we delete from $H - e$ to obtain its k-core.

For every $k \geq 0$, let

$$f_k(\lambda) = e^{\lambda} - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\lambda^i}{i!} \quad \text{and} \quad h_k(\mu) = \frac{e^{\mu}\mu}{f_{k-1}(\mu)}.$$

For $k \geq 3$, let $c_k = \inf\{h_k(\mu) \colon \mu > 0\}$ and let μ_{k,c_k} be such that $c_k = h_k(\mu_{k,c_k})$. We discuss the existence of c_k and μ_{k,c_k} later. Let

$$c'_k = \frac{\mu_{k,c_k} f_{k-1}(\mu_{k,c_k})}{f_k(\mu_{k,c_k})}.$$

Throughout the text, let $c = 2m/n$. The asymptotics will always be with respect to $n \to \infty$. For a sequence of probability spaces $(\Omega_n, \mathbb{P}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, we say that a sequence of events $(E_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ holds asymptotically almost surely (a.a.s.) if $\mathbb{P}_n(E_n) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $k \geq 3$ be a fixed integer. Let $m = m(n)$ and $c = 2m/n$. Then the following hold.*

(i) If $c \geq k$ and $c \to k$, then $W(G(k,n,m)) = n$ a.a.s.

(ii) Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a fixed real. Suppose that $k + \varepsilon \leq c \leq c'_k - \varepsilon$. For any function $h(n) \to \infty$, we have that a.a.s. $W(G(k,n,m)) \leq h(n)$ or $W(G(k,n,m)) = n$. Moreover, $W(G(k,n,m)) = n$ with probability bounded away from zero.

(iii) Let $\psi(n) = \omega(n^{-1/4})$ be a positive function and let C_0 be a constant. Suppose that $c'_k + \psi(n) \leq c \leq C_0$. For every $h(n) = \omega(\psi(n)^{-1})$, we have that $\mathbb{P}(W(G(k,n,m)) \geq h(n)) \to 0$.

We apply Theorem 2.1 to study the robustness of the k-core of $G(n,m)$, the random graph chosen uniformly at random from all graphs on $[n]$ with m edges.

Corollary 2.2. *Let $k \geq 3$ be a fixed integer. Let $m = m(n)$ and suppose that $c = 2m/n = c_k + \psi(n) \geq c_k + n^{-\delta}$ and $c \leq C_0$, where δ is a constant in $(0, 1/4)$ and C_0 is a constant. Then, for every $h(n) = \omega(\psi(n)^{-1})$, we have that $\mathbb{P}(W\big(K\big(G(n,m)\big)\big) \geq h(n)) \to 0$.*

We remark that there are some known results about the k-core of random graphs with given degree sequence under some constraints on the degree sequences (see [6, 3, 5]). Since the degree sequence of a graph G and the degree sequence of $G - e$ for some edge $e \in E(G)$ are very similar, it is intuitive that one can draw some conclusions about $W(G(k,n,m))$. Indeed, in the case $c \in [c_k + \varepsilon, C_0]$ one can use [6] to conclude that $W(G(k,n,m)) = o(n)$ a.a.s. We were not able to derive results for the cases (i) and (ii) directly from known results.

2.1 Models of random multigraphs

We use the allocation model restricted to k-cores (here we allow multigraphs): let $a : [2m] \to [n]$ be chosen uniformly at random among the functions such that $|a^{-1}(v)| \geq k$ for any $v \in [n]$; let $G_{\text{multi}} = G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)$ be the multigraph on $[n]$ obtained by adding an edge joining $a(i)$ and $a(m+i)$ for every $i \in [m]$. Then every simple k-core with n vertices and m edges is generated by $m!2^m$ allocations. This implies that $G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)$ conditioned upon simple graphs is a uniform probability space on k-cores with vertex set $[n]$ and m edges. Multigraphs do not necessarily have the same probability in $G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)$.

Let $\mathcal{D}_k(n, m)$ be the set of $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i = 2m$ and $\min_i d_i \geq k$. For every multigraph H with vertex set $[n']$, let $\mathbf{d}(H)$ denote the degree sequence of H, that is, $(\mathbf{d}(H))_i$ is the degree of vertex i. For any $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \ldots, d_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, let $D_j(\mathbf{d})$ be the number of occurrences of j in $\mathbf{d}$ and let $\eta(\mathbf{d}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \binom{d_i}{2}/m$. We will work with k-cores generated using the pairing model with degree sequences in $\mathcal{D}_k(n, m)$. Given a degree sequence $\mathbf{d}$, let $G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})$ denote the graph generated using the pairing model: arbitrarily choose a partition of $[2m]$ into sets $S_1, \ldots, S_n$ (which we call bins) such that $|S_i| = d_i$ for very i, add a perfect matching uniformly at random on $[2m]$ and contract each S_i to obtain a multigraph. Then $G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)$ conditioned upon $\mathbf{d}(G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)) = \mathbf{d}$ has the same distribution as $G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})$.

It is clear that $\mathbf{d}(G_{\text{multi}})$ has multinomial distribution conditioned upon each coordinate being at least k, which we denote by $\text{Multi}_{\geq k}(n, m)$. We say that a variable Y taking integer values has truncated Poisson distribution with parameters (k, λ) (which we denote by $\text{Po}(k, \lambda)$) if, for every integer j,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = j) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\lambda^j}{j! f_k(\lambda)}, & \text{if } j \geq k; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By straightforward computations, one can show that $\text{Multi}_{\geq k}(n, m)$ has the same distribution as $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$ where the Y_i's are independent truncated Poisson variables with parameters (k, λ) conditioned upon the event Σ that $\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i = 2m$.

3 Random walks and a deletion procedure

3.1 A deletion procedure

We are given a degree sequence $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}_k(n, m)$. Here we describe a procedure for finding the k-core of $G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d}) - e$, where e is a random edge in $G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})$. We will sample $G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})$ using the pairing model by discovering one edge at a time. We start by choosing e by picking two points uniformly at random from the set of all points.

Deletion procedure $(\mathbf{d})$

- Partition $[2m]$ into n bins $S_1, \ldots, S_n$ such that $|S_i| = d_i$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$.

- Iteration 0: Choose e by picking distinct points u and v uniformly at random from $[2m]$. Delete u and v and **mark** all points in bins of size less than k.
- Loop: While there is a marked undeleted point, choose one such point u and find the other end v of the edge incident to u. Delete u and v. If v was in a bin of size exactly k (now of size $k-1$ because we deleted v), mark all the other points in this bin.

After the deletion procedure is over, the k-core can be obtained by adding a random matching uniformly at random on the surviving points. Let $Z_0(\mathbf{d})$ denote the number of marked points after the deletion of the edge e chosen in Iteration 0. Note that $Z_0(\mathbf{d}) \in \{0, k-2, k-1, 2(k-1)\}$.

Let $Y_j(\mathbf{d})$ be the number of undeleted marked points after the j-th iteration of the loop (and $Y_0(\mathbf{d}) := Z_0(\mathbf{d})$). The procedure stops when $Y_j(\mathbf{d}) = 0$. Let $Z_j(\mathbf{d})$ be the number of points that are marked in the j-th iteration of the loop. Let $W(\mathbf{d}) = \sum_j \lceil \frac{Z_j(\mathbf{d})}{k-1} \rceil$. Note that $W(\mathbf{d}) = W(G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d}))$.

We mark new points in an iteration of the loop if v lies in a bin of (current) size k. The probability that this happens (denoted by $p_j(\mathbf{d})$) is the ratio of the number of unmarked points in bins of (current) size k and the number of undeleted points other than the one we are exploring. If v is also a marked point, then no new points will be marked and v is deleted. In this case, $Z_j(\mathbf{d}) = -1$ and the probability that this happens (denoted by $p'_j(\mathbf{d})$) is the ratio of the marked undeleted points other than u and the number of undeleted points other than u. Thus, in the j-th iteration of the loop,

$$Z_j(\mathbf{d}) = \begin{cases} k-1, & \text{with probability } p_j(\mathbf{d}); \\ -1, & \text{with probability } p'_j(\mathbf{d}) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The probabilities of $p_j(\mathbf{d})$ and $p'_j(\mathbf{d})$ are analyzed later.

3.2 Random walks

Given c and k, we will define random walks in $\mathbb{Z}$ that will help us to study the behaviour of the deletion procedure. Let $\lambda_{k,c}$ be the (unique) positive root of $\lambda f_{k-1}(\lambda)/f_k(\lambda) = c$. Such root always exists for $c > k$. For more properties of $\lambda_{k,c}$, see [17]. Let

$$q_{k,c} = \frac{\lambda_{k,c}^{k-1}}{(k-1)! f_{k-1}(\lambda_{k,c})}.$$

Let $Z(k,c)$ be a random variable such that

$$Z(k,c) = \begin{cases} k-1, & \text{with probability } q_{k,c}; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $Y_0 = Z_0(\mathbf{d})$. For $j > 0$, let $Y_j = Y_{j-1} + Z_j - 1$ where Z_j has same distribution as $Z(k,c)$ and the variable Z_j is independent from $Z_1, Z_2, \ldots, Z_{j-1}$. Thus, we defined a random walk such that the position in iteration j is Y_j and the drift is given by $Z_j - 1$. Similarly, for $\xi = \xi(n) \geq 0$ and $\xi \leq 1 - q_{k,c}$, define the random variable $Z^+(k, c, \xi)$ by

$$Z^+(k,c) = \begin{cases} k-1, & \text{with probability } q_{k,c} + \xi; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $Y_0^+ = Z_0(\mathbf{d})$. For $j > 0$, let $Y_j^+ = Y_{j-1}^+ + Z_j^+ - 1$ where Z_j^+ has same distribution as $Z^+(k, c, \xi)$ and the variable Z_j^+ is independent from $Z_1^+, Z_2^+, \dots, Z_{j-1}^+$. Note that $(Y_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(Y_j^+)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ are actually branching processes.

For $\xi = \xi(n) \geq 0$ and $\xi \leq q_{k,c}$, define the random variable and $Z^-(k, c, \xi)$ by

$$Z^-(k,c) = \begin{cases} k-1, & \text{with probability } q_{k,c} - \xi; \\ -1, & \text{with probability } \xi; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $Y_0^- = Z_0(\mathbf{d})$. For $j > 0$, let $Y_j^- = Y_{j-1}^- + Z_j^- - 1$ where Z_j^- has same distribution as $Z^-(k, c, \xi)$ and the variable Z_j^- is independent from $Z_1^-, Z_2^-, \dots, Z_{j-1}^-$.

We say that Y_j is the number of particles alive in iteration j and that Z_j is the number of particles born in iteration j (and similarly for Y_j^+, Z_j^+, and Y_j^-, Z_j^-).

The random walk given by $Z^+(k, c, \xi)$ is going to be used to bound the number of marked points in the deletion process by above, while the random walk given by $Z^-(k, c, \xi)$ will bound it from below. Here we will prove some properties of these random walks.

Recall that $h_k(\mu) = \mu e^\mu / f_{k-1}(\mu)$ and $c_k = \inf\{h_k(\mu) : \mu > 0)\} = h_k(\mu_{k,c_k})$. Here we justify why the infimum is reached and why it is reached by a unique μ. It is easy to see that h_k is differentiable. Moreover, $h_k(\mu) \to \infty$ when $\mu \to 0$ and when $\mu \to \infty$. The first derivative of $h_k(\mu)$ is

$$\frac{e^\mu}{f_{k-1}(\mu)}\Big(1 + \mu - \mu \frac{f_{k-2}(\mu)}{f_{k-1}(\mu)}\Big)$$

Using the fact that $f_{k-2}(\mu) = f_{k-1}(\mu) + \mu^{k-2}/(k-2)!$, it is clear that this derivative is at least 0 iff

$$\frac{\mu^{k-1}}{(k-2)!} \leq f_{k-1}(\mu) \tag{1}$$

and the functions on both sides are convex and increasing for $\mu > 0$. Thus, the function $h_k(\mu)$ must reaches its infimum in a unique point μ_{k,c_k} and the equation $h_k(\mu) = c$ has exactly two roots when $c > c_k$. Let $\mu_{k,c}$ denote the largest root of the equation $h_k(\mu) = c$. Recall that $c'_k = h_k(\mu_{k,c_k})$.

Proposition 3.1. *The following hold:*

- *(i)* $\mathbb{E}\left(Z(k,c)\right)$ *is a strictly decreasing function of* c *for* $c > k$ *and* $\mathbb{E}\left(Z(k,c'_k)\right) = 1$.
- *(ii) For any* $\varepsilon > 0$ *with* $c'_k - \varepsilon > k$, *there exists a positive constant* α *such that* $\mathbb{E}\left(Z(k, c'_k - \varepsilon)\right) > 1 + \alpha$.

(iii) Let $\psi(n)$ be a nonnegative function with $\psi(n) \leq C_0$, where C_0 is constant. There exists a positive constant β such that $\mathbb{E}\left(Z(k, c'_k + \psi(n))\right) \leq 1 - \beta\psi(n)$.

Proof. Let $g(c) = \mathbb{E}\left(Z(k,c)\right)$. Note that $g(c) = (k-1)q_{k,c}$. By the definition of c'_k, we have that (1) holds with equality for $\mu = \mu_{k,c_k}$. This clearly implies $g(c'_k) = 1$. We have that $\lambda_{k,c}$ is a strictly increasing function of c and vice-versa (see the derivative computation in [17, Lemma 1]). If $c > k$, then $\lambda_{k,c} > 0$. Thus, by considering $c = c(\lambda) = \lambda f_{k-1}(\lambda)/f_k(\lambda)$ and differentiating with respect to λ, we get

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} q_{k,c} = \frac{\lambda^{k-2}\left(k - 1 - \mathbb{E}\left(\mathrm{Po}(k-1,\lambda)\right)\right)}{(k-2)! f_{k-1}(\lambda)} < 0$$

since $\mathbb{E}\left(\mathrm{Po}(k-1,\lambda_{k,c})\right) > k-1$. Thus, $g(c)$ is strictly decreasing for $c > k$.

It is easy to see that $c(\lambda)$ is a smooth function on $\lambda \in [\varepsilon', \infty)$ for any $\varepsilon' > 0$. By the Inverse Function Theorem, this implies that $\lambda_{k,c}$ is a smooth function on $c \in [c(\varepsilon'), C_0]$ and so $g(c)$ is a smooth function on c. Thus, the supremum $\sup\{g'(c) : c'_k \leq c \leq C_0\}$ and the infimum $\inf\{g'(c) : c'_k \leq c \leq C_0\}$ are both achieved and are both negative constants since $g(c)$ is strictly decreasing. By the Mean Value Theorem, there are positive constants α and β such that $g(c) \geq 1 + \alpha|c - c'_k|$ for $c(\varepsilon') < c < c'_k$ and $g(c) \leq 1 - \beta|c - c'_k|$ for $c'_k < c < C_0$. ☐

Proposition 3.2. *Let k, c, ξ be such that $\mathbb{E}\left(Z^-(k,c,\xi)\right) > 1+\varepsilon$, for some constant $\varepsilon > 0$. Then $\mathbb{P}(Y_j^- > 0,\ \forall j \geq 0)$ is bounded away from 0 and, for any function $h(n) \to \infty$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(Y_j^- > 0,\ \forall j \geq h(n)\Big) = 1 + o(1).$$

Proof. The first part follows from the fact that $(Y_j^-)_{j\geq 0}$ is a random walk in $\mathbb{R}$ with positive expected drift (see e.g. [4, p. 366]). The second part is a straightforward application of the method of bounded differences since the variables Z_j^- are independent random variables with range $[-1, k-1]$ (see [11]). ☐

4 The case $c > c'_k + \omega(n^{-1/4})$

Here we prove Theorem 2.1(iii). We start by proving a version of Theorem 2.1(iii) for random multigraphs with given degree sequence.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\psi(n) = \omega(n^{-1/4})$ be a positive function and let C_0 be a constant. Suppose that $m = m(n)$ is such that $c = 2m/n$ satisfies $c'_k + \psi(n) \leq c \leq C_0$. Let $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}_k(n,m)$ be such that $|D_k(\mathbf{d}) - \mathbb{E}\left(D_k(\mathbf{Y})\right)| \leq n\phi(n)$ for $\phi(n) = o(\psi(n))$, where $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$ and the Y_i's are independent truncated Poisson variables with parameters $(k, \lambda_{k,c})$. For every $h(n) = \omega(\psi(n)^{-1})$, we have that $\mathbb{P}(W(G_{\mathrm{multi}}(\mathbf{d})) \geq h(n)) = o(1)$.*

Using Theorem 4.1, we can deduce a result about multigraphs with given number of vertices and edges, which is then used to prove Theorem 2.1(iii).

Corollary 4.2. *Let* $\psi(n) = \omega(n^{-1/4})$ *be a positive function and let* C_0 *be a constant. Suppose that* $c = 2m/n$ *is such that* $c_k' + \psi(n) \leq c \leq C_0$*. For every* $h(n) = \omega(\psi(n)^{-1})$*, we have that* $\mathbb{P}(W(G_{\text{multi}}(k,n,m)) \geq h(n)) = o(1)$*.*

Now we prove Theorem 4.1. We will choose ξ big enough so that $Z_j(\mathbf{d})$ is stochastically bounded from above by Z_j^+ for $j \leq t(n)$ steps, where Z_j^+ has the same distribution as $Z^+(k,c,\xi)$. Recall we start the deletion process with n bins with d_i points inside each bin i. Let p denote the initial ratio between the number of points in bins of size k and the total number of points. Note that $p = kD_k(\mathbf{d})/2m = q_{k,c}(1+\phi_1(n))$, for some function $\phi_1(n)$ such that $\phi_1(n) = O(\phi(n))$. Choose $t(n) = \psi(n)^{-1}n^{\alpha}$, where α is constant in $(0,1/2)$. Then, for $1 \leq j \leq t(n)$,

$$\frac{kD_k(\mathbf{d}) - (j+2)(k-1)}{2m-2j-2} \leq p_j(\mathbf{d}) \leq \frac{kD_k(\mathbf{d})}{2m-2j-2}$$

and so $p_j(\mathbf{d}) = p + O(t(n)/n)$. We can assume $h(n) \leq t(n)$. Proposition 3.1 implies that $q_{k,c} \leq 1/(k-1)$. Since $t(n)/n = o(\psi(n))$, we can choose $\xi > 0$ such that $\xi = o(\psi(n))$ and $\xi < 1 - q_{k,c}$ and $Z_j^+ \geq Z_j$ for all $j \leq t$. Now $\mathbb{E}\left(Z^+(k,c,\xi)\right) \leq 1 - \beta\psi(n) + (k-1)\xi$ according to Proposition 3.1 for some positive constant β. Since $\xi = o(\psi)$, we have $\mathbb{E}\left(Z^+(k,c,\xi)\right) \leq 1 - \beta'\psi(n)$ for some positive constant β'. Thus, we have that $\mathbb{E}\left(Y_t^+\right) = O((1-\beta'\psi(n))^{t(n)}) = O(\exp(-t(n)\beta'\psi(n))) = o(1)$ because $t(n) = n^{\alpha}/\psi(n)$ with $\alpha > 0$. This implies that the deletion procedure stops before $t(n)$ steps a.a.s., which proves Lemma 4.1.

4.1 Proof of Corollary 4.2 and Theorem 2.1(iii)

Let $h(n) = \omega(\psi(n)^{-1})$. Choose $\phi(n)$ such that $\phi(n) = o(\psi(n))$ and $\phi(n) = \omega(n^{-1/4})$. First we will prove Corollary 4.2. We will show that the degree sequences that satisfy the hypotheses in Lemma 4.1 are the 'typical' degree sequences for $G_{\text{multi}}(k,n,m)$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(n,m)$ be the set of degree sequences $\mathbf{d}$ satisfying $|D_k(\mathbf{d}) - \mathbb{E}\left(D_k(\mathbf{Y})\right)| \leq n\phi(n)$. Recall that $\mathbf{d}(G_{\text{multi}}(k,n,m))$ has the same distribution as $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1,\ldots,Y_n)$ such the Y_i's are independent truncated Poisson variables with parameters $(k,\lambda_{k,c})$ and conditioned to the event Σ that $\sum_i Y_i = 2m$. Using Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(|D_k(\mathbf{Y}) - \mathbb{E}\left(D_k(\mathbf{Y})\right)| \geq \phi(n)n) \leq \frac{n}{n^2\phi(n)^2}.$$

By [17, Theorem 4(a)], it is easy to see that the probability of Σ is $\Omega(1/\sqrt{n})$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{d}(G_{\text{multi}}(k,n,m)) \notin \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(n,m)) \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y} \notin \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(n,m))}{\mathbb{P}(\Sigma)} = O\left(\frac{n\sqrt{n}}{n^2\phi(n)^2}\right) = o(1). \qquad (2)$$

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, since the set $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(n,m)$ is finite, there exists a degree sequence $\mathbf{d}^*(n)$ such that $\mathbb{P}\big(W(G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d}^*(n))) \geq h(n)\big) = \max\big\{\mathbb{P}\big(W(G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})) \geq h(n)\big) : \mathbf{d} \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(n,m)\big\}$. Set $r(n) = \mathbb{P}\big(W(G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d}^*(n))) \geq h(n)\big)$. Theorem 4.1 implies that $r(n) = o(1)$. Thus, for any sequence $(\mathbf{d}(n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\mathbf{d}(n) \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(n,m)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $\mathbb{P}(W(G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d}(n))) \geq h(n)) \leq r(n) = o(1)$. This is usually expressed by saying that

$\mathbb{P}(W(G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d}(n))) \geq h(n)) \to 0$ uniformly for $\mathbf{d} \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(n,m)$. Together with (2), this implies that $\mathbb{P}(W(G_{\text{multi}}(k,n,m)) \geq h(n)) = o(1)$, proving Corollary 4.2.

We will now prove Theorem 2.1(iii). To deduce the result for simple graphs, we impose further conditions on the degree sequences: let $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_k(n,m)$ be the set of degree sequences in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(n,m)$ that satisfy the conditions that $\max_i d_i \leq n^{\varepsilon}$ for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 0.25)$ and that $|\eta(\mathbf{d}) - \mathbb{E}\left(\eta(\mathbf{Y})\right)| \leq \phi(n)$. One can easily prove that $\text{Var}(Y_i(Y_i-1)) = O(1)$ and so uniformly for n and m with $c < C_0$, by Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(|\eta(\mathbf{Y}) - \mathbb{E}\left(\eta(\mathbf{Y})\right)| \geq \phi(n)\Big) = O\left(\frac{1}{n\phi(n)^2}\right).$$

For $j_0 > 2e\lambda_{k,c}$, we have that $\mathbb{P}(Y_1 > j_0) = O(\exp(-j_0/2))$. This holds because the ratio $\mathbb{P}(Y_1 = j+1)/\mathbb{P}(Y_1 = j)$ is less than $1/e$ for $j \geq j_0/2$ (This is the same equation as [17, Equation (27)]). Thus, $\mathbb{P}(\max_j Y_j \geq n^{\varepsilon}) = O(n\exp(-n^{\varepsilon}/2))$. This implies that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{d}(G_{\text{multi}}(k,n,m)) \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_k(n,m))$ is also $1 + o(1)$. For $\mathbf{d} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_k(n,m)$, the probability of that $G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})$ is simple is already known (see [13, 14]):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d}) \text{ simple}) &= \exp\left(-\frac{\eta(\mathbf{d})}{2} - \frac{\eta(\mathbf{d})^2}{4} + O\left(\frac{\max_i d_i^4}{n}\right)\right)\\ &\sim \exp\left(-\frac{\bar{\eta}_c}{2} - \frac{(\bar{\eta}_c)^2}{4} + O\left(\frac{\max_i d_i^4}{n}\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\eta}_c := \lambda_{k,c} f_{k-2}(\lambda_{k,c})/f_{k-1}(\lambda_{k,c})$. We can apply the same argument on the uniformity of the bound for $\mathbb{P}(W(G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})) \geq h(n)) = o(1)$ as above to $\mathbb{P}(G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d}) \text{ is simple}) - \exp\left(-\eta_c/2 - \eta_c^2/4\right)$ and conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}(G_{\text{multi}}(k,n,m) \text{ is simple}) = \exp\left(-\eta_c/2 - \eta_c^2/4\right) + o(1) = \Omega(1)$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\Big(W(G(k,n,m)) \geq h(n)\Big)\\ &= \mathbb{P}\Big(W(G_{\text{multi}}(k,n,m)) \geq h(n) \,\Big|\, G_{\text{multi}}(k,n,m) \text{ is simple}\Big)\\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(W(G_{\text{multi}}(k,n,m)) \geq h(n))}{\mathbb{P}(G_{\text{multi}}(k,n,m) \text{ is simple})}\\ &= o(1).\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.1(iii).

4.2 The k-core of $G(n,m)$

In this section we prove Corollary 2.2. We will use [16, Theorem 2]. Although this result does not state the number of edges in the k-core, it can be obtained from its proof with the main steps in [16, Equations (6.18),(6.34)] and [16, Corollary 1] applied to J_1. We restate [16, Theorem 2] with the number of edges here:

Theorem 4.3 ([16, Theorem 2]). *Suppose $c > c_k + n^{-\delta}$, $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ being fixed. Fix $\sigma \in (3/4, 1 - \delta/2)$ and $\bar{\zeta} = \min\{2\sigma - 3/2, 1/6\}$. Then with probability $\geq 1 + O(\exp(-n^{\zeta}))$ ($\forall \zeta < \bar{\zeta}$), the random graph $G(n, m = cn/2)$ contains a giant k-core with $e^{-\mu_{k,c}} f_k(mu_{k,c})n + O(n^{\sigma})$ vertices and $(1/2)\mu_{k,c}e^{-\mu_{k,c}}f_{k-1}(\mu_{k,c})n + O(n^{\sigma})$ edges.*

We are now ready to prove Corollary 2.2. Recall that $c \geq c_k + n^{-\delta}$, where $\delta \in (0, 1/4)$. So $\delta = 1/4 - \varepsilon$, where ε is a constant in $(0, 1/4)$. Let $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ be a constant such that $\varepsilon' < 1/4 - \delta/2$. Fix $\sigma = 3/4 + \varepsilon'$. Thus, the average degree of the k-core is

$$\frac{\mu_{k,c} f_{k-1}(\mu_{k,c})}{f_k(\mu_{k,c})}(1 + O(n^{-1/4+\varepsilon'}).$$

Recall that $h'(\mu_{k,c_k}) = 0$ and $h'(\mu) > 0$ for $\mu > \mu_{k,c_k}$. This implies that $\mu_{k,c} = \mu_{k,c_k} + \Omega(c - c_k)$. Moreover, the function $x \mapsto x f_{k-1}(x)/f_k(x)$ is smooth. Thus, the average degree of the k-core of $G(n, m)$ is $(c'_k + \Theta(c - c_k))(1 + O(n^{-1/4+\varepsilon'}))$. Since $c - c'_k > n^{-\delta} = n^{-1/4+\varepsilon}$ with $\varepsilon > \varepsilon'$, the average degree of the k-core is $c'_k + \Omega(c - c_k)$. We can now apply Theorem 2.1(iii) to obtain the desired result.

5 The case $k \leq c \leq c'_k - \varepsilon$: deleting $\Theta(n)$ vertices

The following result is an intermediate step for the proof of Theorem 2.1(i) and (ii) .

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a fixed real. Suppose that $k \leq c \leq c'_k - \varepsilon$. Let $\phi(n) = o(1)$. Let $\mathbf{d}$ be such that $D_k(\mathbf{d}) \geq \mathbb{E}(D_k(\mathbf{Y}))(1 - \phi(n))$, where $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$ and the Y_i's are independent truncated Poisson variables with parameters $(k, \lambda_{k,c})$. Then there exists a constant $\varepsilon' > 0$ (depending on ε) such that, for every function $h(n) \to \infty$, we have that a.a.s. $W(G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})) \leq h(n)$ or $W(G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})) \geq \varepsilon' n$. Moreover, $W(G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})) \geq \varepsilon' n$ with probability bounded away from zero.*

The proof of the following corollary is very similar to the proof in Section 4.1 and so we omit it.

Corollary 5.2. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a fixed real. Suppose that $k \leq c \leq c'_k - \varepsilon$. Then there exists a constant $\varepsilon' > 0$ (depending on ε) such that, for every function $h(n) \to \infty$, we have that a.a.s. $W(G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)) \leq h(n)$ or $W(G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)) \geq \varepsilon' n$. Moreover, $W(G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m))) \geq \varepsilon' n$ with probability bounded away from zero.*

For the case $c \to k$, Theorem 5.1 implies a stronger result because there is a function $h(n) \to \infty$ such that $W(G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)) \geq h(n)$ steps a.a.s. From this one can deduce the following result.

Corollary 5.3. *If $c \geq k$ and $c \to k$, then there exists a constant $\varepsilon' > 0$ such that $W(G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m))) \geq \varepsilon' n$ a.a.s.*

Now we prove Theorem 5.1. We will choose ξ so that $Z_j(\mathbf{d})$ is stochastically bounded from below by Z_j^-, where Z_j^- has the same distribution as $Z^-(k, c, \xi)$, and so that $\mathbb{E}(Z^-(k, c, \xi))$ is bounded away from 1 from above. For $j \geq 1$, we have already seen that

$p_j(\mathbf{d}) = (1+O(j/n)+O(\phi(n)))q_{k,c}$. Moreover, for $j \geq 1$, the probability that $Z_j(\mathbf{d}) = -1$ is at most $(k-1)(j+2)/(2m-2j-2)$.

Proposition 3.1 implies that $q_{k,c} > 1/(k-1)$ and that $\mathbb{E}\,(Z^-(k,c,\xi)) \geq 1+\alpha'-(k-1)\xi$ for some constant $\alpha' > 0$. Choose $\xi \in (0, \alpha'/(k-1))$. Thus, we have $\mathbb{E}\,(Z^-(k,c,\xi)) \geq 1+\alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$. We can now choose $\varepsilon'' > 0$ small enough so that $p_j(\mathbf{d}) \geq q_{k,c} - \xi$ and $\mathbb{P}(Z_j(\mathbf{d}) = -1) \leq \xi$ for all $j \leq \varepsilon'' n$. Thus, we can couple the processes for at least $t(n) = \varepsilon'' n$ steps.

By Proposition 3.2, a.a.s. either $Y_j^- \leq 0$ for some $j \leq h(n)$ or $Y_j^- > 0$ for all j. Moreover, the latter occurs with probability bounded away from zero. Since the coupling holds for $t(n)$ steps with $Z_j^- \leq Z_j(\mathbf{d})$, a.a.s. either $Y_j(\mathbf{d}) = 0$ for some $j \leq h(n)$ or $Y_j(\mathbf{d}) > 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq \varepsilon'' n$. Thus, a.a.s. either $W(G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})) \leq h(n) + 2$ or $W(G_{\text{multi}}(k,n,m)) \geq \varepsilon'' n/(k-1)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.1.

6 The case $k \leq c \leq c_k' - \varepsilon$

In this section we will prove Theorem 2.1(i). We will also prove Theorem 2.1(ii) except for the claim that $W(G(k,n,m)) = n$ with probability bounded away from zero, which is handled in Section 7. We use the differential equation method as described in [19, Theorem 6.1] with stopping times. We will also use some results from [2].

We will use the pairing-allocation model $\mathcal{P}(M, L, V, k)$ as described in [2]: given a set M of points together with a perfect matching E_M on M and two disjoint set L, V let h be chosen uniformly at random from the functions mapping M to $L \cup V$ such that $|h^{-1}(v)| \geq k$ for all $v \in V$ and $|h^{-1}(v)| = 1$ for all $v \in L$. Let $G_{\mathcal{P}} = G_{\mathcal{P}}(M, L, V, k)$ be the multigraph obtained by adding edges joining $h(a)$ and $h(b)$ for every $ab \in E_M$ and $h(a), h(b) \in V$. Note that $G_{\text{multi}}(k,n,m) = G_{\mathcal{P}}([2m], \varnothing, [n], k)$ with $E_M = \{\{i, m+i\} : i \in [m]\}$.

We say that the vertices in V are heavy vertices and the vertices in L are light vertices. We will also say that point $i \in M$ is in v if $h(i) = v$.

Cain and Wormald [2] analyse a deletion procedure for obtaining the k-core. Here we will use a similar procedure with the only modifications being in the first step. The procedure receives as input $h : [2m] \to [n]$ such that $|h^{-1}(v)| \geq k$ for all $v \in [n]$.

Deletion procedure − pairing–allocation (h)**:**

- Let $M = [2m]$, $L = \varnothing$ and $V = [n]$.
- Iteration 0: Choose $i \in [m]$ uniformly at random. Find $v = h(i)$ and $u = h(m+i)$. Delete i and $m+i$ from M. If $u \neq v$ and $|h^{-1}(v)| = k$, then delete v from V, add $k-1$ new elements to L and redefine the action of h on $h^{-1}(v) \setminus \{i\}$ as a bijection to the new elements. Similarly to u, if $u \neq v$ and $|h^{-1}(u)| = k$, then delete u from V, add $k-1$ new elements to L and redefine the action of h on $h^{-1}(u) \setminus \{m+i\}$ as a bijection to the new elements. If $u = v$ and $|h^{-1}(v)| \leq k+1$, then delete v from V, add $|h^{-1}(v)|-2$ new elements to L and redefine the action of h on $h^{-1}(v) \setminus \{i, m+i\}$ as a bijection to the new elements.
- Loop: While $L \neq \varnothing$, choose $j \in h^{-1}(L)$ uniformly at random. Delete j and $m+j$ of M and delete $h(j)$ from L. Find $v = h(m+j)$. If $v \in L$, delete v from L. If

$v \in V$ and $|h^{-1}(v)| = k$, then delete v from V, add $k-1$ new elements to L and redefine the action of h on $h^{-1}(v) \setminus \{i\}$ as a bijection to the new elements.

Let $h_0, M_0.L_0, V_0$ be the values of h, M, L, V, resp., after Iteration 0. Let h_i, M_i, L_i, V_i be the values of h, M, L, V, resp., after the i-th iteration of the loop. Then the proof of [2, Lemma 6] gives us the same conclusion as [2, Lemma 6]:

Lemma 6.1. *Starting with* $h = \mathcal{P}([2m], \varnothing, [n], k)$ *and conditioning upon the values of* M_i, L_i *and* V_i*, we have that* h_i *has same distribution as* $\mathcal{P}(M_i, V_i, L_i, k)$*.*

6.1 The case $c \to k$

Here we prove Theorem 2.1(i). We assume that $c = 2m/n = k + \phi(n)$, where $\phi(n) = o(1)$ and $\phi(n) \geq 0$. Let S_i denote the number of points in heavy vertices just after the i-th iteration of the loop. Let S_0 denote the number of points in heavy vertices after Iteration 0. We will use x as i/n and $y(i/n)$ to approximate S_i/n.

Define $D_\gamma = \{(x, y)\colon -\gamma < 2x < k - \gamma,\ \gamma < y < k + \gamma\}$. Note that D_γ is bounded, connected and open. We choose $\gamma < \min\{\gamma_0/3, k\}$ so that the k-core cannot not empty and smaller than $\gamma_0 n$ a.a.s.(γ_0 is given by Lemma 6.2). Moreover, we work with n big enough so that $\phi(n) < \gamma$. After the first step there are at most $2(k-1)$ points in L_0 and all the other vertices in V_0 and so $S_0 \geq 2m - 2(k-1)$. Then it is clear that $S_0/n \leq k + \phi < k + \gamma$ and $S_0/n > \gamma$.

Let $T_D = \min\{i : (i/n, S_i/n) \notin D\}$. Let W_i denote the number of light vertices after iteration i is performed. We also use the stopping time $T = \min\{i : W_i = 0\}$. That is, there are no light vertices to be deleted and the deletion process has actually ended. We need to check the boundedness hypothesis, trend hypothesis and Lipschitz hypothesis (see [19] for more details). The boundedness hypothesis is trivially true: $|S_i - S_{i+1}| \leq k$ always.

Now we check the trend hypothesis. Let $f(x, y) = -ky/(k - 2x)$. Let H_i denote the history of the process at iteration $i \geq 1$. We need to show that $\xi_1 := |\mathbb{E}\,(S_{i+1} - S_i | H_i) - f(i/n, S_i/n)| = o(1)$ while the $i < T$ and $i < T_D$. We have that $S_{i+1} - S_i$ is zero if j is matched to a light vertex, is -1 if j is matched to a point in a heavy vertex with degree $> k$ and is $-k$ if j is matched to a point in a heavy vertex with degree exactly k. The probability that j is matched to a point in a heavy vertex is $S_i/(2m - 2i - 2)$. The probability that such a heavy vertex has degree k is at least $1 - \sum\{d_i : d_i > k\}/S_i$ where $\mathbf{d}$ is the degree sequence (we do not sample the degree sequence, we just decide if the vertex had degree k or not). But for every possible degree sequence $1 - \sum\{d_i : d_i > k\}/S_i \geq 1 + n\phi(n)/S_i = 1 + o(1)$ whenever $S_i \geq \gamma n$.Then

$$\mathbb{E}\,(S_{i+1} - S_i | H_i) = \frac{-k|S_i|}{2m - 2i - 2} + o(1),$$

and so the trend hypothesis holds. It is easy to see that the Lipschitz hypothesis also holds in $D_\gamma \cap \{(x, y) : x \geq 0\}$.

According to [19, Theorem 6.1], the $y'(x) = f(x, y)$ has a unique solution in D_γ, say y^*, with $y(0) = k$ and a unique solution in D_γ, say y^{**}, with $y(0) = S_0/n$. Note that y^*

is a fixed function while y^{**} is a random variable because S_0 is a random variable. The Lipschitz condition implies that, for any x with both $(x, y^*(x))$ and $(x, y^{**}(x))$ in D_γ, we have that $|y^*(x) - y^{**}(x)| = x|k - S_0/n|R =: \xi_3$, where R is some big constant and so $\xi_3 = o(1)$. Let $\xi_2 = o(1)$ and $\xi_2 > \xi_1$ and $\xi_2 > \xi_3$. By [19, Theorem 6.1], there is a constant C and a function $\xi \to 0$, such that, a.a.s. at each step $i < \min\{T, n\sigma\}$ we have that

$$|S_i - ny^*(i/n)| \leq \xi n, \tag{3}$$

where σ denotes the supremum of x such that $(x', y^*(x'))$ and $(x', y^{**}(x'))$ are at ℓ^∞-distance at least $C\xi_2$ of the boundary of D_γ for all $0 \leq x' \leq x$.

Let ε' be given by Corollary 5.3. For $\varepsilon' < x < (k-\gamma)/2$, we have that

$$(k-2x) - y^*(x) = (k-2x)\left(1 - \left(\frac{k-2x}{k}\right)^{k/2-1}\right) \geq \frac{2\gamma\varepsilon'}{k}.$$

This implies that, if (3) holds at i where $\varepsilon' n < 2i < (k-\gamma)n$, then $W_i = 2m - 2i - 2 - S_i = \Omega(n)$. Thus, if (3) holds for some step $i \in (\varepsilon' n, \sigma n]$ with $T > i$, then $T > i + 1$ because there are still $\Omega(n)$ points to be deleted. This implies that, conditioning upon $T > \varepsilon' n$, we have that $T > \sigma n$ a.a.s.

For any constant $\alpha \in (0, \gamma)$, using the fact that $\xi_3 = o(1)$, there exists x such that $x \leq \sigma n$ and $(x, y^*(x))$ and $(x, y^{**}(x))$ are at ℓ^∞-distance $(C\xi_2, \alpha)$ of the boundary of D_γ. For such an x we have $T > x$ a.a.s. because $T > \sigma n$ a.a.s. Thus, (3) holds a.a.s. Since x is at ℓ^∞-distance at most α of the boundary of D_γ, either $2x \geq k - \gamma - \alpha$ or $y^*(x) \leq \gamma + \alpha$. We excluded $y^*(x) \geq k + \gamma - \alpha$ because $y^*(0) = k$ and y^* decreases as x increases. For n sufficiently large so that $|\xi(n)| < \gamma$, the equation (3) for at either $2x \geq k - \gamma - \alpha$ or $y^*(x) \leq \gamma + \alpha$ shows that $S_i \leq n\gamma_0$ a.a.s.

Since $T > \varepsilon' n$ a.a.s. by Corollary 5.3, the k-core would have to be smaller than $\gamma_0 n$ and so it must be empty a.a.s. (see Section 6.3). We conclude that $W(G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)) = n$ a.a.s. Since the probability that $G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)$ is simple is $\Omega(1)$ (see [13, 14]), we have that $W(G(k, n, m)) = n$ a.a.s.

6.2 The case $c \in [k + \varepsilon, c + k' - \varepsilon]$

We prove Theorem 2.1(ii) except for the claim that $W(G(k, n, m)) = n$ with probability bounded away from zero, which is addressed in Section 7. Let $h(n) \to \infty$. Let ε' be given by Corollary 5.2. Assume that $c \to C \in [k + \varepsilon, c + k' - \varepsilon]$, where C is a constant. We will explain later how to drop this constraint.

Again we use the differential equation method as in [19] and the deletion procedure described in the beginning of the section. For each i, let S_i denote the number of points in heavy vertices just after iteration i, let T_i denote the number of heavy vertices just after iteration i and let W_i denote the number of points in light vertices just after iteration i. We will use the differential equation method to approximate S_i and T_i. Note that $W_i = 2m - 2i - 2 - S_i$. We will use $y(i/n)$ to approximate S_i/n and $z(i/n)$ to approximate T_i/n.

Let γ be a positive constant with $\gamma < \min\{1, C-k\}$ to be chosen later. Define

$$D_\gamma = \{(x,y,z)\colon \gamma < z < 1+\gamma,\ -\gamma < x < C-\gamma,\ \gamma < y < C+\gamma, y > (k+\gamma)z\}.$$

Then D_γ is bounded, connected and open. We have $T_0 \in \{n, n-1, n-2\}$ and $S_0 \in [2m-2-2(k-1), 2m-2]$. Thus, $T_0/n = 1+o(1/n)$ and $S_0/n = C+o(1)$. Then D_γ contains the closure of the points $(0,y,z)$ such that $\mathbb{P}(S_i = yn \text{ and } T_i = zn) \neq 0$ for some n.

We use the stopping time $T = \min\{i : W_i = 0\}$ again. We have to check the boundedness hypothesis, the trend hypothesis and the Lipschitz hypothesis. The boundedness hypothesis is again easy: $|S_{i+1} - S_i| \leq k$ and $|T_{i+1} - T_i| \leq 1$ always.

The trend hypothesis is exactly like in [2] with $|\mathbb{E}\,(T_{i+1} - T_i|H_i) - f_z(i/n)| = \xi_z = o(1)$ and $|\mathbb{E}\,(S_{i+1} - S_i|H_i) - f_y(i/n)| = \xi_y = o(1)$ with

$$f_z(x) = -\frac{y}{C-2x}\left(1 - \frac{\mu z}{y}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad f_y(x) = -\frac{y}{C-2x}\left(k - (k-1)\frac{\mu z}{y}\right),$$

where $\mu = \lambda_{k,y/z}$. The Lipschitz hypothesis is straightforward to check.

According to [19, Theorem 6.1], the $y'(x) = f_y(x)$ and $z'(x) = f_z(x)$ has unique solutions (y^*, z^*) and (y^{**}, z^{**}), with initial conditions $y(0) = C$ and $z(0) = 1$, and $y(0) = S_0/n$ and $z(0) = T_0$, resp. The Lipschitz hypothesis implies that, there exists a constant R such that, for any x with both $(x, y^*(x), z^*(x))$ and $(x, y^{**}(x), z^{**}(x))$ in D_γ, we have $\max\{|y^*(x) - y^{**}(x)|, |z^*(x) - z^{**}(x)|\} \leq x|k - S_0/n|R =: \xi_3$. Note that $\xi_3 = o(1)$. Let $\xi_2 > \xi_z$, $\xi_2 > \xi_y$, $\xi_2 > \xi_3$, $\xi_2 = o(1)$. Thus, by [19, Theorem 6.1], there is a constant C_0 and a function $\xi \to 0$, such that, a.a.s. at each step $i < \min\{T, n\sigma\}$ we have that

$$\max\{|S_i - ny^*(i/n)|, |T_i - nz^*(i/n)|\} \leq \xi n, \tag{4}$$

where σ denotes the supremum of x such that, for all $0 \leq x' \leq x$, we have $(x', y^*(x'), z^*(x'))$ and $(x', y^{**}(x'), z^{**}(x'))$ are at ℓ^∞-distance at least $C_0\xi_2$ of the boundary of D_γ.

According to [2], we have that $\mu^2/(C-2x)$ and $(ze^\mu)/f_k(\mu)$ are constants. With initial conditions $y(0) = C$ and $z(0) = 1$, we get $\mu^2/(C-2x) = \lambda_{k,C}^2/C$ and $ze^\mu/f_k(\mu) = e^{\lambda_{k,C}}/f_k(\lambda_{k,C})$, which can be used to deduce that

$$y^* = (C-2x)\frac{h_k(\lambda_{k,C})}{h_k(\mu)}. \tag{5}$$

For $x \geq \varepsilon'/2$, we must have $\mu(x) \leq \lambda_{k,C}\sqrt{1-\varepsilon'/C}$ and so $h_k(\mu) \geq (1+\varepsilon'')h_k(\lambda_{k,C})$, for some $\varepsilon'' > 0$. Thus, for every x such that $\varepsilon' \leq 2x \leq C-\gamma$ using (5),

$$C - 2x - (C-2x)\frac{h_k(\lambda_{k,C})}{h_k(\mu)} \geq \gamma\varepsilon''.$$

This implies that, if (3) holds at i with $\varepsilon' n < 2i < (C-\gamma)n$, then $W_i = 2m - 2i - 2 - S_i = \Omega(n)$. Thus, if (3) holds for some step $i \in (\varepsilon' n, \sigma n]$ with $T > i$, then $T > i+1$ because there are still $\Omega(n)$ points to be deleted. This implies that, conditioning upon $T > \varepsilon' n$, we have that $T > \sigma n$ a.a.s.

For any constant $\alpha \in (0, \gamma)$, using the fact that $\xi_3 = o(1)$, there exists x such that $x \leq \sigma n$ and $(x, y^*(x), z^*(x))$ and $(x, y^{**}(x), z^{**}(x))$ are at ℓ^∞-distance $(C_0\xi_2, \alpha)$ of the boundary of D_γ. For such an x we have $T > x$ a.a.s. because $T > \sigma n$ a.a.s. Thus, (4) holds a.a.s. Since x is at ℓ^∞-distance at most α of the boundary of D_γ, either $z^*(x) \leq \gamma + \alpha$ or $2x \geq C - \gamma - \alpha$ or $y^*(x) \leq \gamma + \alpha$ or $y^*(x)/z^*(x) \leq k + \gamma + \alpha$. We excluded $y^*(x) \geq C + \gamma - \alpha$ and $z^*(x) \geq 1 + \gamma - \alpha$ because $y^*(0) = C$ and $z^*(0) = 1$ and f_y and f_z are decreasing.

If $2x \geq C - \gamma - \alpha$, then, using that $\mu^2/(C - 2x)$ remains constant and $\mu(0) = \lambda_{k,C}$ with $C < c'_k$, we have that $h_k(\mu) \geq h_k(\lambda_{k,C})$ and so $y^*(x) \leq C - 2x \leq \gamma + \alpha$. For n sufficiently large so that $|\xi(n)| < \gamma$, it is easy to see that the equation (3) for at $y^*(x) \leq \gamma + \alpha$ or $z^*(x) \leq \gamma + \alpha$ implies that $S_i \leq 3\gamma n$ a.a.s. We still have to check what happens when $y^*(x)/z^*(x) \leq k + \gamma + \alpha$. In this case, $\mu = O(\gamma + \alpha)$. This holds because the function $g_k(x) = x f_{k-1}(x)/f_k(x)$ with domain $(0, 2\gamma)$ is strictly increasing and the limit of its one-sided derivative with $x \to 0$ is $1/(k+1)$. This limit can be computed by the derivative of this function which is $(1/x)g_k(x)(1 + g_{k-1}(x) - g_k(x))$ and then using Taylor's approximation for $g_k(x)$ and $g_{k-1}(x)$ around $x \to 0$. For more details on this computation see [17, Lemma 1] and its proof. Using that $\mu^2/(C - 2x)$ during the process, we then have $C - 2x = O(\gamma^2)$, we can then conclude that the $S_i = O(\gamma n)$ a.a.s.

Thus, conditioned upon $T > \varepsilon' n$ the k-core has at most $O(\gamma n)$ vertices a.a.s. Let γ_0 be the constant given by Lemma 6.2. By choosing γ small enough, we can conclude that, conditioned upon $T > \varepsilon' n$, the k-core has less than $\gamma_0 n$ vertices a.a.s. and which implies, by Lemma 6.2, that the k-core must be empty a.a.s. By Corollary 5.2, we have that $W(G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)) \leq h(n)$ or $W(G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)) = n$ with probability $1 + o(1)$ conditioned upon $T > \varepsilon' n$ (where the convergence depends on c).

Recall that we assumed $c \to C$. We show how to drop this assumption here. Let $(c_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that every $c_i \in [k + \varepsilon, c + k' - \varepsilon]$. Let $r(n)$ be the probability that neither $W(G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)) \leq h(n)$ nor $W(G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)) = n$. Then every subsequence of $(c_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a subsequence that converges to some constant C_0 and in that subsequence $r(n) \to 0$. So by the subsubsequence principle $r(n) \to 0$. Since the probability that $G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)$ is simple is $\Omega(1)$, we have that $W(G(k, n, m)) \leq h(n)$ or $W(G(k, n, m)) = n$ a.a.s.

6.3 No small k-cores

Lemma 6.2. *Let C_0 be a constant. Suppose that $m = m(n)$ satisfies $kn \leq 2m \leq C_0 n$. Then there exists a constant γ such that a.a.s. the graph obtained from $G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m)$ by deleting an edge chosen uniformly at random either has a k-core of size at least γn or its k-core is empty.*

Proof. This is an application of a result by Luczak and Janson [6, Lemma 5.1]: if a degree sequence $(\mathbf{d}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies $\sum_i e^{\alpha d_i} \leq Rn$ for constants α and R, then there is a constant γ such that a.a.s. no subgraph of $G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})$ with less than γn vertices has average degree at least k. We set $\alpha < 1/3$ and we will choose R later. Let $\check{\mathcal{D}}_k(n, m) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_k(n, m)$ be the set of degree sequences $\mathbf{d}$ such that $\sum_i e^{\alpha d_i} \leq Rn$. It suffices to show that the degree sequence $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}(G_{\text{multi}}(k, n, m))$ is in $\check{\mathcal{D}}_k(n, m)$ a.a.s.

Let $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$ be such that the Y_i's are independent random variables with distribution $\mathrm{Po}(k, \lambda_{k,c})$. As already mentioned before, $\mathbf{d}$ has the same distribution of $\mathbf{Y}$ conditioned upon the event that $\sum_i Y_i = 2m$. Using [17, Theorem 4], one can prove that $\mathbb{P}(\sum_i Y_i = 2m) = \Omega(1/\sqrt{n})$.

For J_0 big enough (depending only on C_0), we have that $\lambda_{k,C_0}/J_0 \leq e^{-1}$, which implies $\lambda_{k,c}/J_0 \leq e^{-1}$. Clearly, $\sum_{j \leq J_0} e^{\alpha j} D_j(\mathbf{Y}) \leq e^{\alpha J_0} n$. Let $J_1 = J_0 + (1+\beta)\log n$ with $\beta \in (1/2, (2\alpha)^{-1} - 1)$. Let $p = \lambda_{k,c}^{J_0 - 1}/((J_0-1)! f_k(\lambda_{k,c}))$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists j > J_1 \text{ with } D_j(\mathbf{Y}) > 0) \leq np \sum_{i \geq 0} \frac{1}{e^{(1+\beta)\log n + i}} \leq \frac{pn^{-\beta}}{1 - e^{-1}} = O(n^{-\beta}).$$

Using the fact that $\mathbb{P}(\sum_i Y_i = 2m) = \Omega(1/\sqrt{n})$ and $\beta \in (1/2, (2\alpha)^{-1} - 1)$, we conclude that $\mathbb{P}(\max_i d_i > J_1) = o(1)$. And so $\sum_{j > J_1} e^{\alpha j} D_j(\mathbf{Y}) = 0$ a.a.s.

Now we consider $j \in (J_0, J_1]$. By Hoeffding's inequality and using the fact that $\mathbb{P}(\sum_i Y_i = 2m) = \Omega(1/\sqrt{n})$, we have that $\mathbb{P}(|D_j(\mathbf{Y}) - p^{(j)} n| \geq a\sqrt{n}) = O(\sqrt{n}) e^{-a^2}$, where $p^{(j)} = \lambda_{k,c}^{j}/(j! f_k(\lambda_{k,c}))$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big(|D_j(\mathbf{Y}) - p^{(j)} n| \geq a\sqrt{n} \text{ for some } j \in (J_0, J_1]\Big) &= (1+\beta)\log n O(\sqrt{n}) e^{-a^2} \\ &= O(n^{-\beta'}),\end{aligned}$$

for $a = \sqrt{(1+\beta')\log n}$ with $\beta' > 0$. Thus, a.a.s.

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=J_0+1}^{J_1} e^{\alpha j} D_j(\mathbf{Y}) &\leq e^{\alpha J_0} \sum_{j=1}^{(1+\beta)\log n} e^{\alpha j} \left(p \frac{1}{e^j} n + a\sqrt{n} \right) \\ &\leq e^{\alpha J_0} \left(np \sum_{j=1}^{(1+\beta)\log n} e^{-2j/3} + e^{\alpha(J_1 - J_0)} (J_1 - J_0) a \sqrt{n} \right) \\ &\leq e^{\alpha J_0} \left(\frac{p}{e^{2/3}(1 - e^{-2/3})} + \frac{n^{(1+\beta)\alpha + 1/2} (\log n)^{3/2}}{n} \sqrt{1+\beta'}(1+\beta) \right) n.\end{aligned}$$

Using that $1 + \beta < (2\alpha)^{-1}$, we can set $R = e^{\alpha J_0}(1 + p/(1 - e^{-2/3}) + \sqrt{1+\beta'}(1+\beta))$. $\square$

7 Working with simple graphs

Lemma 7.1. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a fixed real. Suppose that $c = 2m/n$ satisfies $k + \varepsilon \leq c \leq c'_k - \varepsilon$. Then there exists a function $h(n) \to \infty$ such that $\mathbb{P}(W(G(k,n,m)) \geq h(n)) = \Omega(1)$.*

Together with Section 6.2, this lemma implies that $\mathbb{P}(W(G(k,n,m)) = n) = \Omega(1)$, which completes the proof of Theorem 2.1(ii).

We now prove Lemma 7.1. We will work with degree sequences. Let $G(\mathbf{d})$ be chosen uniformly at random from all (simple) k-cores with degree sequence $\mathbf{d}$. Let $\phi(n) = o(1)$

with $\phi(n) = \omega(n^{-1/4})$. Let $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$ be such that the Y_i's are independent truncated Poisson variables with parameters $(k, \lambda_{k,c})$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(n,m)$ be the degree sequences $\mathbf{d}$ such that $|D_k(\mathbf{d}) - \mathbb{E}(D_k(\mathbf{Y}))| \leq n\phi(n)$ and $\max_i d_i \leq n^{\beta}$ for some $\beta \in (0, 0.25)$ and $|\eta(\mathbf{d}) - \mathbb{E}(\eta(\mathbf{Y}))| \leq \phi(n)$. Similarly to the proof in Section 4.1, one can prove that $\mathbf{d}(G(k,n,m)) \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(n,m)$ a.a.s. Thus, it suffices to show that, there exists $h(n) \to \infty$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(W(G(\mathbf{d})) \geq h(n)) = \Omega(1),$$

for $\mathbf{d} \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(n,m)$.

For $\mathbf{d} \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(n,m)$, we will couple deletion algorithms for $G(\mathbf{d})$ and $G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})$ so that they coincide for $t(n) \to \infty$ steps. We use a deletion algorithm that is essentially the same as the one we used in the other sections. The only difference is that we explore a whole vertex at a time (instead of an edge at a time) and mark the vertices that have to be deleted.

Deletion procedure by vertex:

- Iteration 0: Choose an edge uv uniformly at random, delete uv and mark the vertices with degree less than k.
- Loop: While there is an undeleted marked vertex, say w, find its neighbours, delete w and the edges incident to it, and then mark all neighbours of w that now have degree less than k.

If we can do such a coupling for $t(n) \to \infty$ iterations of the loop, then we can choose $h(n) \to \infty$ such $h(n) \leq \min\{t(n), \varepsilon' n\}$ with ε' as in Theorem 5.1 so that $\mathbb{P}(W(G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})) \geq h(n)) = \Omega(1)$. This would imply that the deletion algorithm did not stop for at least $h(n)$ steps and so $\mathbb{P}(W(G(\mathbf{d})) \geq h(n)) \geq \Omega(1)$.

In the rest of this section, we show that there exists $t(n) \to \infty$ such that we can couple the deletion algorithms for $G(\mathbf{d})$ and $G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})$ so that they coincide for $t(n)$ iterations of the loop. For now assume that $t(n) \to \infty$ with $t(n) \leq \log n$. Later we add more restrictions on the growth of $t(n)$. We show that the probabilities that a certain edge uv is chosen in the first step are asymptotically equivalent for $G(\mathbf{d})$ and $G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})$ and so the first step can be coupled. For the other steps $i \leq t(n)$, we show that the probabilities that the set of neighbours of the vertex w is some specific set are again asymptotically equivalent for $G(\mathbf{d})$ and $G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})$ with some error $\xi(n) = o(1)$. So we can couple the deletion algorithms for $t(n)$ steps, where $t(n)$ will depend on $\xi(n)$. In the computations in this section, we will use $\mathbb{P}_{\text{multi}}$ to denote the probabilities in the deletion procedure for $G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})$ and we will use $\mathbb{P}$ to denote the probabilities in the deletion procedure for $G(\mathbf{d})$. First we analyse the procedure for multigraphs. Let $uv \in \binom{V}{2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\text{multi}}(uv \text{ is chosen in the first step}) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}_{\text{multi}}(uv \in E(G_{\text{multi}}(\mathbf{d})))}{m} \\
&= \frac{d_u d_v}{m} \frac{(2m-2)! 2^m m!}{(2m)! 2^{m-1}(m-1)!} \\
&= \frac{d_u d_v}{m(2m-1)} = \frac{d_u d_v}{m(2m)}(1 + \xi_1(n)),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\xi_1(n) = o(1)$.

In i-th iteration of the loop, we delete a vertex w and find its set of neighbours U. Let ℓ be the current degree of w and let $\{u_1, \ldots, u_\ell\}$ be a subset of ℓ undeleted vertices. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_\ell$ be an enumeration of the points inside w. Let $y_1, \ldots, y_\ell$ be the points matched to $x_1 \ldots, x_\ell$. Let $\check{m}$ be the number of undeleted edges at the beginning of the i-th iteration of the loop and let $\check{\mathbf{d}}$ be the degree sequence of the current graph. Using $[x]_j := (x)(x-1)\ldots(x-j+1)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(U = \{u_1, \ldots, u_\ell\}) = \ell! \mathbb{P}(y_i \in u_i \ \forall i) = \frac{\ell! \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \check{d}_{u_i}}{2^\ell [\check{m}]_\ell}(1 + \xi_2(n)),$$

where $\xi_2(n) = o(1)$ because $\check{m} \geq m - kt(n) \geq m - k \log n$. Now we have to compute estimates for the probabilities in the deletion algorithm for simple graphs. The following lemma is an application of [12, Theorem 10].

Lemma 7.2. *Let $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}_k(n, m)$ be such that $\max_i d_i \leq n^{0.25}$. Let H be a graph on $[n]$ with at most $kt(n)$ edges. Let L be a supergraph of H with at most k edges more than H such that there is a simple graph G with degree sequence $\mathbf{d}$ such that $G \cap L = H$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(L \subseteq G(\mathbf{d}) \,|\, H \subseteq G(\mathbf{d})) = \frac{\prod_{v=1}^{n} [d_i - h_i]_{j_i}}{2^{|E(J)|} [m]_{|E(J)|}}(1 + \nu(n)),$$

where $\mathbf{h}$ is the degree sequence of H, $J = L - E(H)$, $\mathbf{j}$ is the degree sequence of J, and $\nu(n) = o(1)$.

Notice that to use this lemma one has to check the existence of a simple graph G with certain properties. In our case, Erdős-Gallai Theorem will be enough to ensure such simple graph exists.

Lemma 7.3. *Let n be sufficiently large so that $n - n^{0.25} - k \log n > \sqrt{n}$. Let $n' \geq n - \log n$. Let $\mathbf{g}$ be a sequence on $[n']$ such that $g_1 \geq g_2 \geq \cdots \geq g_{n'}$, $\sum_i g_i$ is even, $g_1 \leq n^{0.25}$, $|\{j : g_j = 0\}| \leq k \log n$. Then there exists a simple graph with degree sequence $\mathbf{g}$.*

The proofs for these lemmas are presented in Section 7.1. Now we can analyse the deletion algorithm for simple graphs. Let $uv \in \binom{V}{2}$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(uv \text{ is chosen in the first step}) = \mathbb{P}(uv \in E(G(\mathbf{d})))\frac{1}{m}.$$

We need to compute $\mathbb{P}(uv \in E(G(\mathbf{d})))$. Note that this is the same as $\mathbb{P}(L \subseteq G(\mathbf{d}) \,|\, H \subseteq G(\mathbf{d}))$ with $L = ([n], \{uv\})$ and $H = ([n], \varnothing)$. In order to use Lemma 7.2, we need to check if there is a simple graph G with $G \cap L = H$ with degree sequence $\mathbf{d}$. This is the same as saying that there exists a simple graph G with degree sequence $\mathbf{d}$ such that $uv \notin E(G)$. It suffices to show that, for every set of vertices $S \subseteq [n] \setminus \{u, v\}$ of size d_v, there is a simple graph with degree sequence $\mathbf{d}'$, where $\mathbf{d}'$ is obtained from $\mathbf{d}$ be deleting v and decreasing the degree of every vertex in S by 1 (that is, S can be the set of neighbours of v and it does not include u). Note that $\sum_i d'_i$ is even because $\sum_j d_j$ is even. Moreover,

$n-1 \geq n-\log n$ and $\max_i d'_i \leq n^{0.25}$ and $\mathbf{d}'$ has no zeroes. By Lemma 7.3, there is a simple graph with degree sequence $\mathbf{d}'$ and so we can use Lemma 7.2 to show that

$$\mathbb{P}(uv \in G) = \frac{d_u d_v}{2m}(1+\xi_3(n)),$$

where $\xi_3(n) = o(1)$. Now suppose we are in the i-th iteration of the loop and deleting a vertex w. Let $\check{n}$ be the number of undeleted vertices in the beginning of iteration i and let $\check{m}$ be the number of undeleted edges at the beginning of iteration i. Let $\check{\mathbf{d}}$ be the current degree sequence (that is, $\check{d}_u$ is the number neighbours u has among the undeleted vertices). At each iteration we delete at most k edges and only one vertex. So $\check{n} \geq n - t(n)$ and $\check{m} \geq m - kt(n)$. Let $\ell := \check{d}_w$ and $\{u_1, \dots, u_\ell\}$ be a set with ℓ (undeleted) vertices. Let U be the neighbours of w discovered in iteration i. We want to compute the probability that $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_\ell\}$. In order to use Lemma 7.2, we have to check if there exists a simple graph G with degree sequence $\check{\mathbf{d}}$ such that $G \cap L = H$, where H is the graph discovered so far (which includes the deleted vertices) and $L = ([n], E(H) \cup \{wu_1, \dots, wu_\ell\})$, which is the same as checking if it is possible to get a simple graph such that w as no neighbours in $\{u_1, \dots, u_\ell\}$. Let U' be a set of ℓ undeleted vertices such that $U' \cap \{u_1, \dots, u_\ell\} = \varnothing$. There are plenty of choices for U' since $t(n) \leq \log(n)$. Let $\mathbf{d}'$ be the degree sequence on $\check{n}-1$ obtained from $\check{\mathbf{d}}$ by deleting w and decreasing the degree of each vertex in U' by 1. Then $\check{n} \geq n - \log n$, $\max_i d'_i \leq n^{0.25}$ and $|\{j : d'_j = 0\}| \leq kt(n) \leq k \log n$. Using Lemma 7.3, there is a simple graph with degree sequence $\mathbf{d}'$ and so, by Lemma 7.2,

$$\mathbb{P}(U = \{u_1, \dots, u_\ell\}) = \frac{\ell! \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \check{d}_{u_i}}{2^\ell [\check{m}]_\ell}(1+\xi_4(n)),$$

where $\xi_4(n) = o(1)$. Thus, there exists a function $\xi(n) = o(1)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(U = \{u_1, \dots, u_\ell\}) = \mathbb{P}_{\text{multi}}(U = \{u_1, \dots, u_\ell\})(1+\xi(n))$$

and, for every $uv \in \binom{V}{2}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(uv \text{ is chosen in the first step}) \sim \mathbb{P}_{\text{multi}}(uv \text{ is chosen in the first step}).$$

We conclude that the deletion algorithms can be coupled for $t(n)$ steps as long as $(1+\xi)^t = 1 + o(1)$. Thus, it suffices to choose $t = o(1/\xi)$.

7.1 Proofs of Lemma 7.2 and Lemma 7.3

Proof of Lemma 7.2. Let Δ_L be the maximum degree in L and let Δ be the maximum degree in D. Note that $\Delta_L \leq |E(H)| + k \leq k \log n + k$ and $\Delta \leq n^{0.25}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}|E(G(\mathbf{d}))| - |E(H)| - |E(J)| &\geq m - kt(n) - k \geq n^{0.25}(2n^{0.25}) \\ &\geq \Delta(\Delta + \Delta_L) =: D.\end{aligned}$$

So we can use part (a) of [12, Theorem 2.10] to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(L \subseteq G(\mathbf{d}) \mid H \subseteq G(\mathbf{d})) &\leq \frac{\prod_{v=1}^{n} [d_i - h_i]_{j_i}}{2^{|E(J)|}[m - |E(H)| - D]_{|E(J)|}} \\ &= \frac{\prod_{v=1}^{n} [d_i - h_i]_{j_i}}{2^{|E(J)|}[m]_{|E(J)|}}(1+\nu_1(n))\end{aligned}$$

with $\nu_1(n) = o(1)$ because $|E(J)| \leq k$ and $m - |E(H)| - D \geq m - k \log n - 2\sqrt{n}$. Now we will use part (b) of Theorem 2.10 from [12]. We have to check the conditions for (b):

$$\begin{aligned}|E(G(\mathbf{d}))| - |E(H)| - |E(J)| &\geq m - kt(n) - k \geq k \geq n^{0.25}(n^{0.25}+1)\\ &\geq \Delta(\Delta + \Delta_L + 2) + \Delta(\Delta_L + 1),\end{aligned}$$

so we can apply [12][Theorem 2.10(b)]. We have to bound some errors given by [12][Theorem 2.10(b)]. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}0 &\leq \frac{\Delta(\Delta_L + 1)}{m - |E(H)| - |E(J)| - \Delta(\Delta + \Delta_L + 2)}\\ &\leq \frac{n^{0.25}(n^{0.25}+1)}{n - k\log n - n^{0.25}(2n^{0.25}+2)} =: \nu_2(n),\end{aligned}$$

with $\nu_2(n) = o(1)$, and

$$\begin{aligned}0 &\leq \frac{\Delta^2}{2(|E(G)| - |E(H)| - D - (1-1/e)|E(J)|)}\\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2(n - k\log n - n^{0.25}(2n^{0.25}) - (1-1/e)k)} =: \nu_3(n),\end{aligned}$$

with $\nu_3(n) = o(1)$ Then [12][Theorem 2.10(b)] implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(L \subseteq G(\mathbf{d}) \mid H \subseteq G(\mathbf{d})) \geq \frac{\prod_{v=1}^{n}[d_i - h_i]_{j_i}}{2^{|E(J)|}[m]_{|E(J)|}}(1+\nu_4(n))\left(\frac{1+\nu_2(n)}{1+\nu_3(n)}\right)^{E(J)}.$$

with $\nu_4(n) = o(1)$. Since $\nu_i(n) = o(1)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, we can conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}(L \subseteq G(\mathbf{d}) \mid H \subseteq G(\mathbf{d})) = \frac{\prod_{v=1}^{n}[d_i - h_i]_{j_i}}{2^{|E(J)|}[m]_{|E(J)|}}(1+\nu(n)),$$

where $\nu = o(1)$. ☐

Proof of Lemma 7.3. We will use Erdős-Gallai Theorem: $\mathbf{g}$ is the degree sequence of a simple graph iff, for every $1 \leq \ell \leq n'$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} g_i \leq \ell(\ell-1) + \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{n'} \min\{\ell, g_j\}.$$

If $\ell \geq n^{0.25}+1$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} g_i \leq \ell g_1 \leq \ell(\ell-1)$. If $\ell \leq n^{0.25}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} g_i &\leq \ell n^{0.25} \leq \sqrt{n} \leq n - n^{0.25} - k\log n \leq n' - \ell - |\{j\colon g_j = 0\}|\\ &= \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{n'} 1 - |\{j\colon g_j = 0\}| \leq \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{n'} \min\{\ell, g_j\}.\end{aligned}$$

☐

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my advisor Nicholas Wormald for his supervision during this project.

References

[1] B. Bollobás. The evolution of sparse graphs. In *Graph theory and combinatorics (Cambridge, 1983)*, pages 35–57. Academic Press, London, 1984.

[2] J. Cain and N. Wormald. Encores on cores. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 13(1):Research Paper 81, 13 pp. (electronic), 2006.

[3] C. Cooper. The cores of random hypergraphs with a given degree sequence. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 25(4):353–375, 2004.

[4] W. Feller. *An introduction to probability theory and its applications. Vol. I.* Third edition. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1968.

[5] D. Fernholz and V. Ramachandaram. The giant k-core of a random graph with specified degree sequence. Manuscript available at `http://www.cs.utexas.edu/~fernholz/`, November 2003.

[6] S. Janson and M. J. Luczak. A simple solution to the k-core problem. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 30(1-2):50–62, 2007.

[7] S. Janson and M. J. Luczak. Asymptotic normality of the k-core in random graphs. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 18(3):1085–1137, 2008.

[8] J. H. Kim. Poisson cloning model for random graphs. In *International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. III*, pages 873–897. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2006.

[9] T. Łuczak. Size and connectivity of the k-core of a random graph. *Discrete Math.*, 91(1):61–68, 1991.

[10] T. Łuczak. Sparse random graphs with a given degree sequence. In *Random graphs, Vol. 2 (Poznań, 1989)*, Wiley-Intersci. Publ., pages 165–182. Wiley, New York, 1992.

[11] C. McDiarmid. On the method of bounded differences. In *Surveys in combinatorics, 1989 (Norwich, 1989)*, volume 141 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 148–188. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1989.

[12] B. D. McKay. Subgraphs of random graphs with specified degrees. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Southeastern Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing, Vol. II (Baton Rouge, La., 1981)*, volume 33, pages 213–223, 1981.

[13] B. D. McKay. Asymptotics for symmetric 0-1 matrices with prescribed row sums. *Ars Combin.*, 19(A):15–25, 1985.

[14] B. D. McKay and N. C. Wormald. Asymptotic enumeration by degree sequence of graphs with degrees $o(n^{1/2})$. *Combinatorica*, 11(4):369–382, 1991.

[15] M. Molloy. M. Math Thesis, University of Waterloo, 1992.

[16] B. Pittel, J. Spencer, and N. Wormald. Sudden emergence of a giant k-core in a random graph. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 67(1):111–151, 1996.

[17] B. Pittel and N. C. Wormald. Asymptotic enumeration of sparse graphs with a minimum degree constraint. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 101(2):249–263, 2003.

[18] O. Riordan. The k-core and branching processes. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 17(1):111–136, 2008.

[19] N.C. Wormald. The differential equation method for randweoom graph processes and greedy algorithms. In M. Karonski and H.J. Proemel, editors, *Lectures on Approximation and Randomized Algorithms*, pages 73–155. PWN, Warsaw, 1999.